

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/639,672	08/12/2003	John Michael Fenkanyn	DN2003130	6824	
27280	7590 10/07/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	YEAR TIRE & RUBB	FAYYAZ, NASI	FAYYAZ, NASHMIYA SAQIB		
	JAL PROPERTY DEPAI	RTMENT 823	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	IARKET STREET 44316-0001		2856		

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			H.6			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/639,672	FENKANYN, JOHN MICHAEL				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Nashmiya S. Fayyaz	2856				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 10/16/05 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA	ATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOV	VANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 Cl	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A</li> </ul>	•	in the final rejection, wh	ichavar is later. In			
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on 16 September 2005. A of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any repl AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	)), or any extension thereof (37 CFI	R 41.37(e)), to avoid	dismissal of the			
	3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);				
appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ampliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mphane / menamene	(1.102-024).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will will not be entered, or b) ☐ will will will will will be will be will will be wil	If be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.  10. The affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.			
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As to p. 2, italized sentence on lines 2-3 of the second full paragraph, consider the following: The claim does not call for projecting the tool "into a bore" (highlighting added). The claim calls for "as the remote tip socket is withdrawn from the bore". Waterman's tool is withdrawn in a direction away from the bore of vessel 64. The term "withdrawn" does not necessily demand that the tool was ever "inside" the bore. In addition, the tool does release the probe as the tip of the tool is withdrawn in a direction away from the bore. Specifically, please note that after handle 97 is turned to "lock the collet" (col. 6, line 19), that the tool's piston 92 is still contacting the top most surface of the probe 20. The, the probe is inside the socket, and has yet to have been removed from the tool. After the collet is locked, the tool (along with its accompanying tip) is withdrawn in a direction away from the bore, and the probe 20 is released from the socket "as" the remote tip socket is withdrawn. Please be aware that the claim does not call for placing the tool inside of the bore. This may be the point that explains the discrepancy between Applicant's claim 1 and accompanying arguments. The arguments are more narrow than the claimed subject matter. Further, with regard to the argument that "no unobstructed passageway is formed by a socket", again it is noted that there is no claim language reciting such. Also, other limitations have been argued such as the body does not project into the bore or the length of the body does not correlate with the bore depth, etc which are limitations that are also not found in the claims. Also, there is a socket 85 in Waterman and there is no claim language reciting pushing against an "end of the probe". Regarding the other arguments such as a removable handle or other dependent claims, please refer to the final rejection discussion. Regarding the other arguments such as a removable handle or other dependent claims, please refer to the final rejection discussion. Regarding the

HEZRON WILLIAMS

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

gu L. Will

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800